Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/620,184	OZONO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Mark A. Osele	1791	

	Mark A. Osele	1791			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 14 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (sometiment). They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belotic). They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a contraction. 	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying the			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the					
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,5,6,9-11,13 and 16. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu Applicants argue that using a thin chip such as that of Ki the suction holes and then dragged back up to the stage	<u>urosawa in the invention of Akira w</u>	ould result in the chip			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:					